

RICHARD, D.  
09/787,952

### REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the Official Action dated December 12, 2003. The above amendment and remarks to follow are intended to be fully responsive to the issues presented in that Action.

Claims 1, 2, 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Bolenz et al. Claims 3, 8 and 11 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bolenz et al. in view of Dyches et al. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

With regard to the present invention, the alternator/starter 1 and the supplementary starter 5 do not simultaneously perform a starting function. Independent claim 6 recites “the operation of the main electrical machine in the motor mode is cut off when at least one condition for activation of the supplementary starter is detected.” (see claim 6, last line). Claim 1 recites “management means include means for cutting off the operation of the main electrical machine in motor mode, when a condition for activation of the supplementary starter is detected.” See claim 1, last phrase.

With regard to the prior art, Bolzen teaches an arrangement whereby “with temperatures of the internal combustion engine under 30-40°C; a conventional starter and the starter/generator device 33 operating as a motor together perform the starting function.” See Bolzen ‘632, col. 4, lines 22-25. Notably, the electrical machine is not cut off when at least one condition for activation of the supplementary starter is detected – as claimed.

RICHARD, D.  
09/787,952

Further, claims 1 and 6 recite that in a first phase the starter is supplied with power and the main machine is cut off. In a second phase, the "main electrical machine is put into motor mode when the pinion of the starter has been meshed". See claims 6 and 7.

The prior art fails to disclose these characteristics as recited in the claims. Dyches discloses a starting apparatus having only a starter motor, not a starter and a supplemental starter.

Therefore, in light of the foregoing amendments and comments, the rejections under both 35 USC § 102 and 35 USC § 103 are improper. It is respectfully submitted that this application containing claims 1-3, 6-8 and 11 is in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe additional discussion would advance the prosecution of the instant application, he is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted:  
Liniak, Berenato & White

Dated: 6/12/03

Suite 240  
6550 Rock Spring Drive  
Bethesda, MD 20817  
301-896-0600

By:   
Matthew Stavish  
Reg. No. 36,286